

Remarks

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 were rejected under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Mantell (6189993). To support the Section 102 rejection, Mantell must teach each and every claim limitation, it must be enabling, and it must describe the claimed subject matter sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *Helifix Ltd. v. Blok-Lok*, 208 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2131.

Claim 1 recites a printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected toner density setting and the printer controller automatically selecting a print media source based upon the operator-selected toner density setting. Claim 7 recites a printer controller configured to automatically recognize a selection of one of a plurality of settings for a first print job parameter and, in response to recognizing the selection of the first print job parameter setting, automatically select one of a plurality of settings for a second print job parameter. Claim 8, depending from Claim 7, recites that the first print job parameter comprises toner density and the second print job parameter comprises a source of print media.

Toner Density Setting. Mantell is directed to an inkjet printer, not a laser printer. Mantell, therefore, does not teach any kind of toner density setting. It is axiomatic, therefore, that Mantell does not teach the act of ascertaining a toner density setting (Claim 1) or automatically recognizing a toner density setting (Claim 8).

Printer Controller Ascertaining and Selecting. There is no teaching in Mantell that printer controller 21 ascertains any operator-selected settings or that printer controller 21 automatically selects a print media source based on the operator-selected setting. On the contrary, it is clear that any such acts in Mantell are performed by the user or by printer driver 84.

Mantell teaches a printer driver 84 recommending a print media by highlighting the recommended media in a selection menu. Mantell explicitly teaches that the user, not the printer driver, makes the print media selection. "Upon selection of one of the print quality modes and one of the media types, the user would, if satisfied with the selections, would [sic] select the OK selector 112 to begin printing."

Serial No. 09/726,966
Attorney Docket No. 10003088-1
Response To Office Action

Mantell column 7, lines 60-63 (emphasis added). Mantell actually teaches away from the printer controller 21 (or even printer driver 84) automatically selecting the print media.

In Mantell, the printer driver 84 makes recommendations and the user makes selections. Even if the recommendation made by printer driver 84 is deemed a selection of some sort, it must still be validated by the user. The recommendation "selection", therefore, cannot reasonably be deemed an automatic selection as claimed. In any event, neither the recommendation nor the selection is made by printer controller 21. Mantell simply does not teach a printer controller automatically selecting a print media in based on the selection of a print quality mode.

For all of these reasons, it seems clear that Mantell does not teach all of the limitations of Claims 1, 7 and 8. Claims 1, 7 and 8, therefore, distinguish patentably over Mantell. For these same reasons, Claims 2-3 and 10 also distinguish patentably over Mantell.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 5, 9 and 11 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Mantell. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office must show that Mantell teaches or suggests all claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.

Claim 4 recites a printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected print media source setting and the printer controller automatically selecting a toner density setting based upon the operator-selected print media source setting. Claim 9 recites a printer controller configured to automatically recognize a selection of one of a plurality of settings for a source of print media and, in response to recognizing the selection of the source of print media, automatically select one of a plurality of settings for a toner density.

The Section 103 rejection is based on the assertion that Mantell teaches the limitations of Claims 1 and 8 and that it would be obvious to modify these teachings in Mantell to do it "the other way" as recited in Claims 4 and 9. As noted above for the Section 102 rejections, Mantell fails to teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 8. For the same reasons, the modification of Mantell to reach Claims 4 and 9 must likewise fail. That is to say, if Mantell does not teach a printer controller

Serial No. 09/726,966
Attorney Docket No. 10003088-1
Response To Office Action

automatically selecting a print media source based upon a toner density setting, then Mantell cannot be modified to suggest a printer controller automatically selecting a toner density setting based upon a print media source setting.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney For Applicant
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

Serial No. 09/726,966
Attorney Docket No. 10003088-1
Response To Office Action

--7--